



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Called applicant's attorney to discuss proposed claim amendments that would place the application in condition for allowance. It was agreed on that the proposed claim amendments would be communicated to the attorney for review and approval. In a subsequent interview on May 21, 2010 proposed "adapted to" language was discussed with respect to claim 1 and proposed "non-transitory" language with respect to claim 33. As to claim 1, examiner indicated that "adapted to" language is not acceptable because according to MPEP section 2111.04 claim scope is not limited by claim language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed. It was agreed on that "adapted to" language will be removed and claim steps will be positively recited in the allowed version of claim 1. As to claim 33, examiner indicated that addition of "non-transitory" in the "machine-readable medium" claims is necessary to limit the claim to cover only statutory embodiments such as those directed to non-transitory tangible media. Examiner verified that addition of "non-transitory" as proposed, only excludes transitory propagating signals per se in view of the ordinary and customary meaning of machine-readable media. As a result of the interview, an authorization from the applicant's attorney was granted for this examiner's amendment.